

### **REMARKS / ARGUMENTS**

The Examiner has objected to the drawings, based on the Specification, pages 3 and 4, stating that the "Brief Description of the Drawings does not seem to belong in this Application". The Examiner is correct, and the original pages 3 and 4 that DO belong in this Application have been provided with this Amendment as amendments to the Specification, above. Since the "Brief Description of the Drawings and Detailed Description" of pages 5-10 of the Specification are correct, the objection to the drawings is deemed to be overcome.

Claim 60 was objected to, and has been corrected as per the Examiner's instructions.

Claims 1-18, 51-68 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 51 have been amended so as to resolve all antecedent basis problems. Claim 64 has been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, is deemed to be overcome.

Claims 1-29 and 31-68 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,931,602 B1 to Silver et al. ("Silver"). Claims 2, 9, 31, 35, 40, 45-50, 54, and 64-68 have been canceled, without prejudice.

Independent claims 1, 19, 39, and 51 have been amended such that each now requires either a "validator", as shown as element 408 in Fig. 4 of Applicant's specification, or the act of "validating", as set forth in elements P602 and/or P604 of Fig. 6.

Although the Examiner has asserted that "commands may be used to perform vision parameter checking", citing col. 7, lines 30-48. However, it is clear that the "parameters" are not checked or validated here, but are merely the parameters of a "diagnostic" (col. 7, lines 41-42) so as to construct the diagnostics, as shown in Fig. 18.

In fact, there is no functionality anywhere in Silver that performs the function of "validating", as taught in Figs. 4 and 6, and as taught in the accompanying portions of the specification, and further, as now required in each of the independent claims, and therefore required in all the dependent claims as well. Accordingly, the rejection of all of the claims rejected under 35 USC 102(e) is deemed to be overcome.

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,931,602 B1 to Silver et al. ("Silver"), in view of US Patent 5,928,335 to Morita ("Morita").

Claim 30 depends from claim 22, which depends from claim 19, herein deemed to be allowable for the reasons stated above. Since Morita does not teach anything relating to "validating", or relating to a "validator", it does not

Appl. No. 09/842,948  
Amdt. dated November 25, 2005  
Reply to Office action of 08/25/2005


repair the deficiency of Silver. Therefore, combining Silver with Morita does not result in Applicant's invention, as now claimed in the claims amended herein. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 30 is deemed to be overcome.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon does not appear to present an impediment to the allowance of the present claims.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that the present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to phone the undersigned attorney to further the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 11/25/05

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Russ Weinzimmer', is written over a horizontal line.

Russ Weinzimmer, Esq.  
Registration No. 36,717  
Attorney for Applicants

P.O. Box 862  
Wilton, NH 03086

Tel: 603-654-5670  
Fax: 603-654-3556